



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.        | CONFIRMATION NO.       |
|--|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/672,106   | 09/26/2003  | Rami Caspi           | 2003P08211US               | 7727                   |
| 7590<br>Siemens Corporation<br>Intellectual Property Department<br>170 Wood Avenue South<br>Iselin, NJ 08830 |             |                      |                            |                        |
|  |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>LEE, JUSTIN YE |                        |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2617           | PAPER NUMBER           |
|  |             |                      | MAIL DATE<br>03/24/2009    | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/672,106

**Applicant(s)**

CASPI ET AL.

**Examiner**

Justin Y. Lee

**Art Unit**

2617

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-14 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-14 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/7/09 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 1, 4-11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones, JR. (U.S. 2001/0042849 A1) in view of Camhi (US 6,762,684) and further in view of Silver et al. (US 20070082668 A1, hereinafter, Silver).

As to claim 1, Jones discloses:

A telecommunications device (20), comprising:

a positioning controller (GPS 22) adapted to determine positioning information for said telecommunications device (paragraph 19); and a wireless communications controller (24) adapted to receive said positioning information from said positioning controller and cause an audible alarm ("speaker or buzzer" - paragraph 24) to be generated if said telecommunications device is determined to be out of a first predetermined geographic range (paragraph 19, 23); wherein said wireless communications controller is adapted to cause positioning information to be transmitted to an associated administration device (server 40 or endpoint 60) when said telecommunications device is determined to be outside said first predetermined geographic range (paragraph 24) and

an alarm has been generated in response to a request from the administration device (paragraph 27).

However, Jones fails to disclose said telecommunications device is determined to be outside said first predetermined geographic range for longer than a predetermined period after said audible alarm has been generated.

In a similar field of endeavor, Camhi discloses a system where upon detecting that the subject is beyond his permitted geographic confines, the processor may

implement the annunciator to provide an audible or visual warning to the subject followed by a communication of such out of boundary condition to the central station, in the event the subject does not correct the out of boundary condition within a specified time interval (see column 5, lines 14-23), which reads on the claimed, "said wireless controller is adapted to cause positioning information to be transmitted to an associated administration device when said telecommunication device is determined to be outside said first predetermined geographic range for longer than a predetermined period after said audible alarm has been generated."

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jones with Camhi to include the above delay before reporting the out of boundary condition in order to allow the subject a chance to correct the condition as suggested by Camhi (see column 5, lines 14-23).

Jones also disclose a presence controller for defining one or more availability rules of the device depending on a position condition of the telecommunications device (abstract).

Jones and Camhi do not disclose a presence controller for defining a plurality of availability rules associated with a user of the device depending on a position condition of the telecommunications device.

Silver further discloses a presence controller (presence server 100 or customer profile 112) for defining a plurality of availability rules (Fig. 4-5) associated with a user of the device depending on a position condition of the telecommunications device (paragraph 6, 34 and 44 and Fig. 4-5, presence server 110 or customer profile 112 has

table 400 which has a list of availability rules defining where the communication should be routed depending on the user's location).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Silver into the teachings of Jones and Camhi for the purposes of automatically directing calls based on user's location so that no communication will be missed.

As to claim 4, Jones and Camhi and Silver teach everything as applied in claim 1 and Jones also discloses:

positioning controller receives Global Positioning System (GPS) signals to determine said positioning information (paragraph 24).

As to claim 5, Jones and Camhi and Silver teach everything as applied in claims 1 and 4 and Jones also discloses:

said wireless communications controller is a cellular telephone controller (paragraph 19).

As to claim 6, Jones and Camhi and Silver teach everything as applied in claims 1 and 4 and Jones also discloses:

said wireless communications controller is a personal communications service (PCS) controller (paragraph 19).

As to claim 7, Jones and Camhi and Silver teach everything as applied in claim 1 and Jones also discloses:

said predetermined range includes a geographic, date, daily routine, and time-of-day ranges (paragraph 20).

As to claim 8, Jones and Camhi and Silver teach everything as applied in claim 1 and Jones also discloses:

said positioning controller is adapted to receive predetermined range information via said wireless communications controller (paragraph 23).

As to claim 9, Jones discloses:

A telecommunications system (Figure 1), comprising:

a wireless device (20) including a positioning controller (22) and a communications controller (24), said wireless device adapted to cause an audible warning to be generated if said wireless device is determined to be outside a first predetermined geographic range (paragraph 19, 23); and an administrative device (server 40 or endpoint 60) for receiving alerts from said wireless communication device via said communications controller when said positioning controller determines that said wireless device is outside said first predetermined geographic range (paragraph 24);

availability of the user including being independent of the wireless device (abstract, the system reports the wearer of a wireless communications device is unavailable within the predetermined location); and

wherein said positioning controller sends an alert in response to a request from the administrative device (paragraph 27).

However, Jones fails to disclose for longer than a predetermined period or is outside said first predetermined geographic range and a second predetermined geographic range and after said audible warning has been generated, but wherein said positioning controller does not send an alert if said wireless device returns to said first predetermined geographic range within the predetermined period.

In a similar field of endeavor, Camhi discloses a system where upon detecting that the subject is beyond his permitted geographic confines, the processor may implement the annunciator to provide an audible or visual warning to the subject followed by a communication of such out of boundary condition to the central station, in the event the subject does not correct the out of boundary condition within a specified time interval (see column 5, lines 14-23), which reads on the claimed, "said wireless controller is adapted to cause positioning information to be transmitted to an associated administration device when said telecommunication device is determined to be outside Said first predetermined geographic range for longer than a predetermined period after said audible alarm has been generated."

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jones with Camhi to include the above delay before reporting the out of boundary condition in order to allow the subject a chance to correct the condition as suggested by Camhi (see column 5, lines 14-23).

Jones also disclose a presence controller for defining one or more availability rules of the device depending on a position condition of the telecommunications device (abstract).



Jones and Camhi do not disclose a presence system for defining one or more availability rules associated with a user of the device depending on a position condition of the wireless device, availability of the user including availability via a medium separate from the wireless device.

Silver further discloses a presence system for defining one or more availability rules associated with a user of the device depending on a position condition of the wireless device, availability of the user including availability via a medium separate from the wireless device (paragraph 6, 34 and 44 and Fig. 4-5, presence server 110 or customer profile 112 has table 400 which has a list of availability rules defining where the communication should be routed depending on the user's location).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Silver into the teachings of Jones and Camhi for the purposes of automatically directing calls based on user's location so that no communication will be missed.

As to claim 10, Jones and Camhi and Silver teach everything as applied in claim 9 and Jones further discloses:

said positioning controller receives global positioning network signals for determining a position of said wireless communications device (paragraph 24).

As to claim 11, Jones and Camhi and Silver teach everything as applied in claims 9-10 and Jones further discloses:

said communications controller comprises a cellular network controller for transmitting on a cellular telephone network to said administrative device (paragraph 19).

As to claim 14, Jones discloses:

A telecommunications method (paragraph 2), comprising: affixing a wireless device (20) to a predetermined object (paragraph 17); and programming said wireless device to be in a first predetermined geographic range (paragraph 19); generating an audible warning if said wireless device is determined to be outside said first predetermined geographic range (paragraph 24); and transmitting one or more alerting signals to an administrative device (server 40 or endpoint 60) when said wireless device is determined to be outside said first predetermined geographic range (paragraph 24); availability of the user including being independent of the wireless device (abstract, the system reports the wearer of a wireless communications device is unavailable within the predetermined location); and

transmitting one or more alerting signals to the administrative device responsive to a request from the administrative device (paragraph 27).

However, Jones fails to disclose said wireless device is determined to be outside said first predetermined geographic range for longer than a predetermined period after said audible warning has been generated. The Examiner contends this feature was old and well known in the art at the time of invention as taught by Camhi.

In a similar field of endeavor, Camhi discloses a system where upon detecting that the subject is beyond his permitted geographic confines, the processor may

implement the annunciator to provide an audible or visual warning to the subject followed by a communication of such out of boundary condition to the central station, in the event the subject does not correct the out of boundary condition within a specified time interval (see column 5, lines 14-23), which reads on the claimed, "said wireless controller is adapted to cause positioning information to be transmitted to an associated administration device when said telecommunication device is determined to be outside said first predetermined geographic range for longer than a predetermined period after said audible alarm has been generated."

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jones with Camhi to include the above delay before reporting the out of boundary condition in order to allow the subject a chance to correct the condition as suggested by Camhi (see column 5, lines 14-23).

Jones also disclose a presence controller for defining one or more availability rules of the device depending on a position condition of the telecommunications device (abstract).

Jones and Camhi do not disclose programming a presence system with one or more availability rules associated with the first geographic range for contacting a user of the wireless device including via telecommunications devices other than the wireless device.

Silver further discloses programming a presence system with one or more availability rules associated with the first geographic range for contacting a user of the wireless device including via telecommunications devices other than the wireless device

(paragraph 6, 34 and 44 and Fig. 4-5, presence server 110 or customer profile 112 has table 400 which has a list of availability rules defining where the communication should be routed depending on the user's location).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Silver into the teachings of Jones and Camhi for the purposes of automatically directing calls based on user's location so that no communication will be missed.

5. Claims 3, 12, 13 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones and Camhi and Silver et al. (US 20070082668 A1, hereinafter, Silver) as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Chaco (U.S. 7,034,690 B2).

As to claim 3, Jones and Camhi and Silver teach everything as applied in claim 1; however, neither Jones nor Camhi and Silver fail to disclose said wireless communications controller is adapted to cause positioning information to be transmitted to an associated administration device when said telecommunications device is determined to be outside a second predetermined geographic range. The Examiner contends this feature was old and well known in the art at the time of invention as taught by Chaco.

In an analogous art, Chaco teaches said wireless communications controller is adapted to cause positioning information to be transmitted to an associated administration device when said telecommunications device is determined to be outside

a second predetermined geographic range (column 8, lines 59-67; column 9, lines 8-i0).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to require the telecommunications device and wireless communications controller, taught by Jones and Camhi and Silver, said wireless communications controller is adapted to cause positioning information to be transmitted to an associated administration device when said telecommunications device is determined to be outside a second predetermined geographic range, as taught by Chaco, in order to detect the wireless device's movement from one area to another and initiating an alarm or instituting a search when unwarranted movement is detected

As to claim 12, Jones and Camhi and Silver teach everything as applied in claim 9 above; however, neither Jones nor Camhi and Silver teach said administrative device is adapted to display location information when said wireless device is determined to be outside said second predetermined range. The Examiner contends this feature was old and well known in the art at the time of invention as taught by Chaco.

Chaco also teaches said administrative device is adapted to display location information when said wireless device is determined to be outside said second predetermined range (column 4, lines 28-31).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to require the system and administrative device, taught by Jones and Camhi and Silver said administrative device is adapted to display location information

when said wireless device is determined to be outside said second predetermined range, as taught by Chaco, in order to detect the wireless device's movement from one area to another and initiating an alarm or instituting a search when unwarranted movement is detected.

As to claim 13, Jones and Camhi and Silver teach everything as applied in claim 9 above and Chaco teach everything as applied in claim 12 and Jones further discloses:

said predetermined range is associated with one or more of a geographic range, time-of-day range, daily routine, or date range (paragraph 20).

As to claim 16, Jones and Camhi and Silver teach everything as applied in claim 14; however, neither Jones nor Camhi and Silver fail to disclose transmitting one or more alerting signals to an administrative device when said wireless device is determined to be outside a second predetermined range. The Examiner contends this feature was old and well known in the art at the time of invention as taught by Chaco.

In an analogous art, Chaco teaches transmitting one or more alerting signals to an administrative device when said wireless device is determined to be outside a second predetermined range (column 8, lines 59-67; column 9, lines 8-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to require the method, taught by Jones and Camhi and Silver., transmitting one or more alerting signals to an administrative device when said wireless device is determined to be outside a second predetermined range, as taught by Chaco, in order to detect the wireless device's movement from one area to another and initiating an alarm or instituting a search when unwarranted movement is detected.

As to claim 17, Jones and Camhi and Silver teach everything as applied in claim 14 and Chaco teaches everything as applied in Claim 16 and Jones further discloses:

said administrative device comprises a telephony device (paragraph 17).

As to claim 18, Jones and Camhi and Silver teach everything as applied in claim 14 and

Chaco teaches everything as applied in claim 16 and Jones further discloses:  
said one or more alerting signals comprise one or more e-mail signals (paragraph 25).

As to claim 19, Jones and Camhi and Silver. teach everything as applied in claim 14 and Chaco teaches everything as applied in claim 16 and Jones further discloses:  
said one or more alerting signals comprise one or more Instant Messaging signals (paragraph 25).

As to claim 20, Jones and Camhi and Silver teach everything as applied in claim 14 and Chaco teaches everything as applied in claim 16 and Jones further discloses:

said first and second predetermined ranges are associated with at least one of geographic range, daily routine, time-of-day range, or date range (paragraph 20).

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 1/7/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the Jones reference, Applicant disagrees that Jones teaches sending an alert in response to a request from the administrative device.

In response to Applicant's assertions, Jones teaches the endpoint 60 can send a request to device 20 to request its current position or trigger a visual or sound alarm (paragraph 27).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin Y. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-5258. The examiner can normally be reached on M - Thu 9:30 to 8:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Eisen can be reached on 5712727687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Justin Y Lee/



Application/Control Number: 10/672,106

Page 16

Art Unit: 2617

Examiner, Art Unit 2617

3/17/09

***/Alexander Eisen/***

***Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617***